

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 20 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are pending in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

A. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

On page 7, the Office Action indicates that Applicant's prior arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. That is, the Office Action sets forth a new grounds of rejection and rejects claims 1-6 and 8-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al (US 6584505) in view of Gupta et al (US 6226752) and further in view of Grandcolas et al (EP 1089516). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The various features of claim 1 are set forth above.

On page 3, the Office Action asserts that Howard teaches various features of claim 1. Further, the Office Action goes on to assert that Howard fails to disclose the use of session token and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system and both the first and that both the first and second system have protected resources.

The Office Action then attempts to cure these deficiencies with the teachings of Gupta and Grandcolas. That is, the Office Action asserts that however, Gupta teaches the use of session credentials (see column 11 lines 10-25) and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and

the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid credential with the second system and both the first (see column 11 line 39 through column 13 line 40) while Grandcolas et al teaches both the first and second system have protected resources (see page 2 paragraph [0006]).

In the rejection, the Office Action then asserts that at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the session token, the inputting and granting of Gupta and for both systems to provide protected resources as taught by Grandcolas in the system of Howard. The Office Action asserts that the motivation to do so would have been to provide a single sign on solution for the web (see Gupta et al column 6 lines 4651) and to provide a single sign on user access to multiple web servers (see Grandcolas Abstract). These assertions are traversed.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness to reject claim 1. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. For at least the following two reasons, the Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness to reject claim 1 based on Howard.

In particular, Applicant submits that the motivation provided fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness to reject claim 1. As noted above, the Office Action asserts that the motivation to combine the art as proposed would have been to provide a single sign on solution for the web (see Gupta et al column 6 lines 4651) and to provide a single sign on user access to multiple web servers (see Grandcolas Abstract). However, the primary reference to Howard already provides just such capability. Thus, the reason the Examiner uses to combine the references is not supportable.

That is, in the summary of the invention, Howard teaches the described invention allows a web user to maintain a single login ID (and associated password) that provides access to multiple web servers or services, and that once the user has logged into an authentication server, it is not necessary to re-enter the login ID or user information when accessing other affiliated web servers. Howard describes the single login ID has an associated user profile that contains the registration information typically requested by web servers during a user registration process.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the motivation supporting the proposed combination of art is not supportable. That is, the one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify Howard so as "to provide a single sign on solution for the web and to provide a single sign on user access to multiple web servers" as alleged in the Office Action. Indeed, one of the very purposes of Howard is to provide such capability.

Further, Applicant submits that such alleged motivation vis-à-vis the proposed modifications to Howard is so attenuated so as to not be supportable.

Further, Applicant submits that the proposed modification of Howard is in conflict with the teachings of Howard. Aspects of Howard are described in column 8, lines 38-67. Howard

teaches the user of the client computer system 100 accesses a web page on the affiliate server 104 (step 230). The affiliate server determines that the user is not authenticated (with respect to the affiliate server) and redirects the user's browser to the authentication server (step 232). Next, the authentication server retrieves the affiliate information entered during registration of the affiliate to determine whether the most recent authentication of the user is within the affiliate's timeout period (step 234). If the most recent authentication is not within the timeout period (i.e., not acceptable), then the authentication server retrieves and authenticates the user's login ID and password (step 238) using, for example, the procedures discussed above with respect to FIG. 4.

In column 8, Howard goes on to explain that if the most recent authentication is acceptable, then the authentication server *copies* the appropriate cookies to the client computer system and *redirects* the user's browser back to the affiliate server (step 240). The authentication server also copies certain elements of the user's profile information to the affiliate server (step 242). The affiliate server then generates a personalized web page and communicates the web page to the user's browser (step 244). The affiliate server also copies a cookie to the client computer system containing information indicating that the user of the client computer system has been authenticated and indicating the period of time during which the authentication is valid. Each time the user enters a new web page request on the same affiliate server, the data in the cookie is copied to the affiliate server along with the page request. Thus, the affiliate server will not repeatedly check the authentication of a user during each subsequent page request.

Based on the above teachings of Howard, the system of Howard clearly involves the

fundamental architecture of working off an authentication server. Relatedly, and of particular note vis-à-vis the rejection, Howard teaches in column 7, lines 36043, that cookies written to the client computer system by the authentication server cannot be read by any affiliate server. Howard describes that similarly, cookies written to the client computer system by a particular affiliate server cannot be read by any other affiliate server. The cookies written by an affiliate server are encrypted using a key that is unique to the affiliate server, thereby preventing other affiliate servers from reading the data stored in the cookies.

Such teachings of Howard are in direct conflict with the proposed modifications of Howard, as set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed modification of Howard, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, is not supportable, in that such is destructive of core teachings of Howard.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-12, 13, 17 and 20 recite patentable subject matter for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Further, the various dependent claims recite patentable subject matter at least for their various dependencies on the independent claims, as well as for the additional subject matter such dependent claims recite.

B. Conclusion

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
HUNTON & WILLIAMS


James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500

Dated: 2-20-07